United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

In Reply refer to:

Klamath Falls Fish and Wildlife Office
6610 Washburn Way
Klamath Falls, Oregon 97603
(541) 885-8481 FAX (541) 885-7837

Date: September 7, 2006

To: All Parties Interested in Submitting Watershed Restoration, Research or Assessment Proposals for the Hatfield Restoration Program

Re: FY 2007 Request for Proposals (RFP)

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and Klamath Basin Ecosystem Restoration Office (ERO) invite Pre-proposals for actions to recover listed species, restore the ecosystem, and improve reliability of water deliveries in the Upper Klamath Basin, Oregon and California. The FWS may provide funds for this work to public agencies, for-profit and non-profit organizations, Native American tribes, and individuals. We encourage private landowners and for-profit entities to work closely with a local watershed council or non-profit group. Funding is anticipated at approximately $1,550,000 for on-the-ground restoration projects, $240,000 for research and assessment proposals, and $50,000 for the Small Grants Partnership Program. The RFP is available on the internet at: *http://www.fws.gov/klamathfallsfwo/ero/2007rfp/2007rfp.pdf* or at the FWS office. Pre-proposals are to be sent electronically or delivered to the ERO on CD, and are due **October 5, 2006**.

Watershed restoration work is part of the Hatfield Restoration Program authorized by Congress in 1996. It is administered by the ERO, with guidance provided by the Upper Klamath Basin Working Group (Hatfield Committee) and the Hatfield Restoration Science Team, which is composed of representatives from resource agencies, tribes and private consulting firms. The Science Team has drafted a 5-Year Plan for Restoration of the Upper Klamath Basin (Appendix 1). The emphasis in 2007 is on the recovery of endangered Lost River and shortnose suckers, and the habitat upon which they depend, particularly around Upper Klamath Lake and the Sprague River. (Note: We have prioritized vegetation and grazing management along riparian areas, as well as reconnecting springs and breaching dikes, rather than more costly channel realignment projects, until we have more data regarding effectiveness.)

- ***Restoration Projects:*** About $1,550,000 will be granted to on-the-ground restoration projects that support the objectives listed on the 5-Year Plan. Possible projects are suggested in the 5-Year Plan (Appendix 1), although proposals need not be limited to those projects listed. Proposers will be responsible for securing all applicable permits for the project. Signed agreements between private landowners and FWS will be required prior to funding.
- ***Research and Assessment:*** $240,000 will be granted to proposals that will provide information useful in advancing the objectives listed on the 5-Year Plan. Specific research and assessment projects being sought are identified in Appendix 1. As the FWS now has a monitoring program to evaluate the efficacy of the Restoration Program, we are not seeking monitoring proposals this year.

- ***Small Grants Partnership Program:*** About $50,000 will be granted to small restoration projects (up to $25,000 each) on private ownerships that address the recovery of federal trust species such as bull trout, Lost River and shortnose suckers. We encourage private landowners to work with the local watershed council or a non-profit group. Small grants do not require a Pre-proposal or Detailed Proposal as outlined in this RFP. Please contact ERO staff directly to request a small grant (Akimi King 541-885-2515, Sue Mattenberger 541-885-2519, or Robert Parrish 541-885-2513). FWS contribution to the project is generally limited to less than 50% of the total cost, with cost-share making up the remainder. Projects will be selected using criteria similar to the Hatfield Restoration Program (Appendix 6).

Preference will be given to parties that demonstrate cost-sharing with other partners and in-kind contributions by landowners to leverage limited funds available for these types of activities. Other funding programs include those offered by the Bureau of Reclamation, Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board, Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Forest Service, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and others.

We are soliciting short Pre-proposals of less than two pages for Restoration, Research or Assessment projects directed toward achieving the objectives and priority projects listed in the 5-Year Plan in Appendix 1. Land acquisition and mitigation will not be considered for funding. Pre-proposals must be prepared in the format outlined in the enclosed Format for Pre-proposal (Appendix 2), and submitted electronically or on CD, as a single file in .PDF format. Pre-proposals will be reviewed by the Science Team for potential merit in mid-October. Parties will be notified by October 20, 2006.

For those Pre-proposals that the Science Team has accepted, we will request Detailed Proposals (Appendix 3) with Budgets (Appendix 4) and Project Summaries (Appendix 5). Detailed Proposals will be due December 15, 2006. These will be reviewed and ranked by the Science Team in February, based on agreed-upon criteria (Evaluation Criteria, Appendices 6 & 7). The prioritized list of proposals will then be reviewed by the Upper Klamath Basin Working Group, and their recommendation will go to ERO for a final decision on funding. If you have questions, please contact Dave Ross, ERO Manager, at the above letterhead address or phone number.

Pre-proposals must be submitted electronically or on a CD, in a single .PDF file, no later than **October 5, 2006** to the following e-mail address: ***kfalls@fws.gov***. Thank you for your effort.

Sincerely,

Curt Mullis
Field Supervisor

Appendices (8)

1. 5-Year Plan for Restoration of the Upper Klamath Basin
2. Format for Project Pre-Proposals
3. Format for Detailed Project Proposals
4. Estimated Budget Worksheet
5. Project Summary Sheet
6. Evaluation Criteria for Restoration Project Proposals
7. Evaluation Criteria for Research and Assessment Project Proposals
8. Contracting Requirements

APPENDIX 1. 5-YEAR PLAN FOR RESTORATION OF THE UPPER KLAMATH BASIN

5-YEAR PLAN FOR LAKE RESTORATION

HATFIELD SCIENCE TEAM

Geographic Location A	Focus of Action B	Action C	5-yr Goal D	Relationship to Science Team Objectives E	Target Project Area F	Possible Projects G	Measurable Effects of Specific Project H	Desired Outcome I
Upper Klamath Lake & Agency Lake	Fish habitat provided by wetlands and related open-water areas	Reconnect wetlands to the lake, providing more natural (nonlinear) edges and large open water areas that may have lower internal nutrient load than the lake, and thus better water quality for fish	Reconnect Tulana, and perhaps other Lower Williamson River Delta wetlands and Caledonia; planning process on other wetlands nearly complete	Large-scale improvements to habitats known to be important to suckers; net increase in water storage capacity of UKL	Lower Williamson River Delta	Reconnect Tulana/Goose Bay portion of Delta to lakes and river	Large increase in wetland edge habitat for larval and juvenile suckers; large new open water areas for adult and juvenile suckers, possibly with better water quality than rest of lake during summer	Increased probability of successful sucker year-class formation; adult suckers use interior open water areas when water quality gets bad in UKL; assess impacts on algal growth
	Water quality improvements provided by wetlands	Restore historic wetlands	Restore wetlands adjacent to northeast and northwest UKL; 15,000 acres	Improve water quality, possibly increase humics released into the lake and decrease algae, increase juvenile fish habitat, understand the system better for adaptive mgmt	Lower Williamson River Delta	Restore wetlands at Tulana/Goose Bay portion of Lower Williamson River Delta, reconnecting to lakes and river, assess impact on algal growth	Wetlands at Tulana restored, impact on algal growth assessed	Decreased nutrient loading to UKL, possible increased humics to UKL, possible overall decreased severity of algal blooms
		Better utilize existing wetlands	Manage existing federally owned ranches to mimic natural wetland/lake interaction; 50,000 acres		Wood River Ranch	Manage return water to encourage wetland vegetation & increase juvenile fish habitat	Improved management of return water for wetland vegetation and juvenile fish habitat	Reduced nutrient load, potentially increased humics, increased juvenile fish habitat
						Adjust near-term water quality (WQ) management if indicated	Reduced nutrients and potentially increased humics	Higher water quality refuge areas, more juvenile suckers
					Hanks' Marsh	Repair internal dike	Prior wetland restoration repaired so that it processes agricultural flow	Measurable reduction in nutrients and sediments

						Construct berms across channels to force return flow to go through marsh	Return flows forced through marsh	Measurable reduction in nutrients and sediments
		Construct treatment wetlands where appropriate	20 1-5 acre wetlands receiving irrigation runoff		Sevenmile	Separate west canal from the flow of Sevenmile so that fish keying into Wood River are not misdirected	100% of ag water flows into Wood River or Agency Lake (anywhere but Sevenmile)	Measurable increase in fish passage through Wood River
						Pilot Project: Develop treatment wetlands and adjust timing of discharges to reduce nutrient load; develop criteria for design and O&M of other treatment wetlands	2 pilot projects, 1-10 acres, 3 or more years of data	Measurable reduction in nutrients and sediments; criteria for other design and O&M
	Springs	Enhance springs in lake and re-introduce spawning populations of suckers	All springs restored, including Barkley and Harriman	Suckers successfully producing larvae from Barkley and Harriman springs; spawning habitat enhanced at other in-lake springs	Barkley Springs at Hagelstein Park	Reconstruct & enhance habitat for sucker spawning	Habitat reconstructed & enhanced	Springs are used by suckers for spawning again
					Harriman Spring	Restore habitat & reintroduce spawning groups	Spawning habitat enhanced as needed, suckers re-introduced	Harriman Spring again supports spawning for a self-perpetuating sucker population

5-YEAR PLAN FOR RIVER RESTORATION

HATFIELD SCIENCE TEAM

Geographic Location A	Focus of Action B	Action C	5-yr Goal D	Relationship to Science Team Objectives E	Potential Project Area (on public lands or with willing landowners) F	Possible Projects G	Measurable Effects of Specific Project H
Sprague River & Associated Springs & Tributaries (flat valley bottoms above Beatty Gap highest priority for top-down restoration, water quality, and nutrient load reduction; flat valley bottoms below Beatty Gap, high priority for restoration benefits to sucker habitat, water quality, and nutrient load reduction; springs and tributaries on valley floor high priorities for sucker habitat and water quality benefits)	Riparian / wetland management	Off-stream water supply	30 established	All riparian/wetland corridor along river channel in flat valley bottom has (1) vegetative recovery/maintenance; (2) upward trend for vegetation with strong roots (sedges, rushes, willows, etc.); (3) extensive riparian vegetation trapping sediments at high flows; (4) river/stream channel narrowing over time; this will measurably reduce suspended sediment and associated nutrient load, and encourage channel narrowing, which brings many water quality and fish habitat benefits and increases sub-irrigation of floodplain crops; in addition, landowner satisfaction with the program and participation in the program are high.	Willing landowners throughout system; additional criterion is an evaluation of whether channel manipulation is advisable as well or instead of vegetation mgmt (see 11 in Research)	Grazing management plans with fencing and off-stream water supply as needed	Direct, measurable benefits to water quality, nutrient loading, and fish habitat. These projects will also, in conjunction with ongoing programmatic research, (a) allow relatively accurate prediction about the improvements in WQ and habitat and (b) provide a stronger basis for choosing among different management approaches.
		Grazing management	All of river corridor				
		Fencing	50% of river corridor, as appropriate				
		Operations & Maintenance (O&M) (i.e., of fencing)	Program in place for replacement, community-friendly monitoring, and weed control inside riparian fences		Throughout system	Develop a suite of more durable fencing design options	More durable fences; greater landowner satisfaction
						Crew for fencing O&M	95% of previously established riparian fencing is operating well, greater landowner satisfaction.
						Crew for weed control inside riparian corridor fences	Landowners have help controlling weed problems related to enhancement actions; greater landowner satisfaction
						Develop a plan for community-friendly monitoring	Fewer downed-fences and weed problems; greater landowner satisfaction.
		Enhance springs, especially large ones with ponds and/or	Inventory all large springs, measure water quality and super-	Measurable increase in sucker spawning and water quality in main river channel; decrease surface runoff; better understanding of role of	Choice of channel manipulation plus riparian management, or riparian management alone,	Inventory all large springs with ponds and/or channels large enough for fish use; assess water quality and super-saturation	Provide basis for prioritizing spring restoration

		channels	saturation; enhance all large springs (appropriate vegetation on upward trend, channel dimensions limit warming, accessible to fish)	springs in system	is site-specific.	Enhance springs, especially large ones with ponds and/or channels	Relatively rapid, measurable improvements to WQ, nutrient loading, and fish habitat will occur; in conjunction with ongoing programmatic research, will allow (a) relatively accurate prediction about the improvements in WQ and habitat and (b) a stronger basis for choosing among different management approaches.
	Irrigation and water management	Eliminate surface return flows to river	Inventory all surface return flows, and identify all potential sites for treatment wetlands; treat 50% of surface return flows.	Allows natural nutrient and sediment removal, reduces erosion and stream bank degradation, provides cooler return flows, and allows prioritization of projects.	Throughout system	Inventory all surface return flows	Provide basis for prioritizing areas to treat return flows
						Treat surface return flows.	Relatively rapid, measurable improvements to WQ, nutrient and thermal loading, and fish habitat; in conjunction with ongoing programmatic research, will allow (a) relatively accurate prediction about the improvements in WQ and habitat and (b) a stronger basis for choosing among different mgmt approaches.
		Treatment wetlands	Construct several treatment wetlands; measure effects of treatment wetlands; develop guidelines for successful development/ management; construct additional treatment wetlands where applicable.			Identify all potential sites for treatment wetlands	Provide basis for prioritizing areas for treatment wetlands
						Construct treatment wetlands; measure effects	Relatively rapid, measurable improvements to WQ, nutrient loading, thermal loading and fish habitat; in conjunction with ongoing programmatic research, will allow (a) relatively accurate prediction about the improvements in WQ and habitat and (b) a stronger basis for choosing among different mgmt approaches.
						Develop guidelines for successful development/management of treatment wetlands	Provide basis for developing and managing successful treatment wetlands
		Improve water management so that stream flows approximate a more natural hydrograph.	Increase irrigation efficiencies to reduce withdrawals; restore wetlands and riparian hydrologic functions.	Decrease nutrient loading from return flows; keeps in-stream flows higher and reduces overall impact to a stream's hydrograph (i.e., flows more similar to natural hydrograph)	Sprague and Wood River primarily; Williamson secondarily.	Include projects that improve irrigation efficiencies	Generalized hydrogeomorphic principles, observation, and anecdotal evidence suggest that restoring ecosystem function restores stream flow to a more natural hydrograph through groundwater/surface water interactions. Reducing overall diversions also accomplishes this as well as reducing nutrient loading. These projects, properly monitored, in conjunction with ongoing programmatic research, will allow the quantification of these benefits.

	Channel manipulation (e.g., channel realignment, narrowing, earth-moving projects)	Main river channel and tributaries	Clear guidelines established for where and when manipulation is appropriate, based on results of assessments and monitoring of implemented projects.	When appropriate, this approach can have the most rapid effect on channel morphology and its functionality for fish habitat, water quality, etc.	Existing channel modification projects	See 5-Year Plan for Research & Assessment, #11	Essential to help make decisions about when and where these types of projects should be constructed to improve fish habitat & water quality
			Manipulation of channels where appropriate		Choice between channel manipulation and riparian vegetation management is site-specific; for diked reaches, channel manipulation is likely the only option.	Dike removal and associated channel modifications with strong monitoring programs	Measurable increase in sucker spawning in springs; localized WQ improvement in main river channel; decrease surface runoff; better understanding of role of springs in system
		Springs	All large springs re-connected to river; spawning and refugial habitat is improved or maintained. (Note: as evaluation is ongoing, these could be prioritized.)	Measurable benefits to both water quality and fish habitat	Choice of channel manipulation and riparian management techniques is site-specific. (For diked reaches, channel manipulation is likely the only option.)	Re-connect large springs to river for fish use, improve spawning/refuge habitat	
	Improve Fish Passage	Fish screens and ladders at diversion dams	All diversions presently impeding or blocking fish passage.	Ensure suckers can reach areas with suitable habitat	Throughout system	Fish screens at diversions, ladders at diversion dams	Ensure suckers can reach areas with suitable habitat
		Remove Chiloquin Dam	Removal is accomplished.	Improved access to Sprague River habitat, improve downriver spawning habitat, eliminate reservoir habitat for non-native predators.	Chiloquin Dam	Remove Chiloquin dam	Ensure suckers can reach areas with suitable habitat, restore natural sediment dynamics important for downstream spawning gravel, eliminate reservoir habitat for non-native predators.

Wood River Valley and Lost River (prioritize Wood River Valley [WRV] as most likely area for successful sucker re-introduction, WRV also has high potential for nutrient loading reduction to UKL)	Re-introduce suckers	Develop and implement re-introduction plan	Re-introduction program underway; planning completed, 3-4 years of actual re-introduction accomplished	Move towards sucker recovery by establishing more populations, taking advantage of existing higher quality habitat, increase understanding of successful re-introduction process.	Sevenmile Creek, Wood River and tributaries	Develop plan for proper genetic management and logistics	Manage intended and unintended consequences of re-introduction
						Confine adults ready to spawn in areas with suitable habitat	Implementing re-introduction plan may successfully re-establish suckers in Wood River system. (Life cycle dictates that evaluating success will take years, because many adults won't return to spawn for the first time until they are 5-7 years old.) Requires strong monitoring component.
						Out-plant embryos or larvae	
	Irrigation management	Eliminate surface return flows to rivers and lake	Inventory all surface return flows, and treat 50% of surface return flows.	Reducing nutrient loading to Agency Lake may help decrease biomass of algae; in Lost River, will improve water quality for all sucker life stages.	Throughout system	Reduce surface return flows to canal system and streams	Localized improvement in water quality, overall reduction in nutrient loading to aquatic systems already over-burdened with nutrients
		Treatment wetlands	Identify all potential sites for treatment wetlands; construct several 1-10ac wetlands receiving irrigation runoff; measure effects of treatment wetlands; develop guidelines for successful development/ management; where appropriate, construct additional treatment wetlands.		Wood River Valley, Lost River System	Identify all potential sites for treatment wetlands	Provide basis for prioritizing where to develop treatment wetlands
						Measure effects of treatment wetlands, develop guidelines for successful development/ management	Provide basis for developing/managing successful treatment wetlands
						Develop treatment wetlands for return flows along Lost River	Relatively rapid, measurable improvements to WQ, nutrient loading, and temperature
						Develop treatment wetlands for return flows into Sevenmile Canal	
						Pump lake water for irrigation and for seasonal wetlands establishment	
	Improve Fish Passage	Fish screens and ladders at diversion dams	All diversions presently impeding or blocking fish passage.	Ensure suckers can reach areas with suitable habitat	Throughout system	Fish screens and ladders installed at diversion dams where appropriate	Ensure suckers can reach areas with suitable habitat

5-YEAR RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT NEEDS FOR WETLAND AND RIVER RESTORATION

HATFIELD SCIENCE TEAM

#	Needs	Where	Status	Tells You	Matters Because
1	Dynamics and inter-relationships among internal/external P loading/algal biomass/water quality/fish stress	Upper Klamath and Agency Lakes	Ongoing in part, more needed	How large a reduction in external and internal P loading is required to reduce algal biomass to the point that water quality stress to suckers is reduced	Determines priority for projects (raise or lower the priority of P-reducing projects); establishes realistic P-reduction targets and time scales
2	Larval/juvenile sucker recruitment bottlenecks	Upper Klamath and Agency Lakes		Relative importance of larval production, water quality, habitat, entrainment, and exotic fish interactions on larval/juvenile survival	Sets priority for actions aimed at increasing larval/juvenile sucker survival (recruitment)
3	Nutrient & water quality dynamics of former lake-edge wetlands under various mgmt options (w/ and w/o breaching)	Wood River Ranch; Agency Lake/Barnes; Caledonia; Williamson River Delta		Ramifications of breaching dikes around former wetlands (extent of restored wetlands, water quality [WQ] in open water areas, influence on lake, etc.) relative to alternative management schemes within dikes.	Sets priority for breaching dikes
4	Non-native predator responses to reconnecting former wetlands to UKL (perch, bass, fathead minnows)	Williamson River Delta		Whether colonization of reconnected habitats by non-native predators outweighs other benefits to suckers	Re-evaluate benefits to suckers from reconnecting former wetlands to the lake
5	Influence of humic releases from wetlands on algal production	Upper Klamath/Agency Lakes	Ongoing, more needed	Magnitude of the spatial and temporal effect of wetland-generated humics on biomass and species composition of the algal community, and the related water quality	If humics do reduce algal growth, likely would shift priority towards restoration of more lacustrine wetlands; establish realistic expectations about the magnitude of the effect
6	Assessment of reduction of nutrient load through treatment wetlands and timing of discharge	Sevenmile Canal; Sprague River Basin		How much nitrogen and phosphorus can be removed from agricultural and pasture land runoff	Sets priority for actions aimed at reducing nutrient loading; establish realistic expectations about the magnitude of the effect
7	Hydrodynamic study	Upper Klamath and Agency Lakes	Ongoing, should be extended to Agency Lake	How wind affects circulation patterns and vertical mixing in Upper Klamath and Agency Lakes	Important for determining in-lake transport processes that ultimately provide insight into lake water quality and ecosystem response
8	Nutrient/sediment loading to the Sprague River		Ongoing in part, needs to be expanded	Whether the nutrient and sediment loading to the Sprague River (and to UKL) are being reduced by restoration measures	Guides location and types of projects, and generates realistic expectations about the effects of projects
9	Continuous water quality monitoring network throughout Sprague			Temperature, oxygen, pH	Establishes baseline conditions and effects of restoration
10	Bathymetry	Sprague River Basin	18 miles done, need more	Topography of the river channel	Used to plan and design river restoration projects and to evaluate active and passive restoration on river morphology which is an indicator habitat for aquatic organisms

11	Continue Sprague assessment; develop guidelines for appropriate approaches (active and/or passive) to restoration projects based on Sprague assessments (USGS/UO & GMA reports)	Sprague Basin	Ongoing, second phase of USGS/UO study imminent; GMA's report in 2006	Geomorphological conditions in the Sprague River and lower Sycan River	Certain geomorphic conditions are more conducive to either active or passive restoration; will allow us to direct restoration appropriate to conditions.
12	Bench scale P	Sprague Basin	USGS, NRCS, and the Klamath Tribes team to analyze existing data & develop proposal for detailed analysis of P sources & sinks in Sprague; USGS lead	P sources by location & soil type in Sprague and Sycan	Sets priority by soil type; the USGS study will go well beyond an evaluation of soil type
13	LiDAR	Sycan from Coyote Bucket to Torrent Spring	Done for Sprague & Sycan river valleys, need above Sycan	This is a tool for restoration work, both evaluating sites and designing restoration projects.	
14	Annual or Biannual Progress Report of Restoration			What is working and what is not; should begin with a comprehensive review of existing projects	Guides future management choices, facilitates adaptive mgmt on current projects, and provides for public accountability
15	Sprague River sediment bed load study			Sediment bed load study of the Sprague	Provides information on the sources and locations of bed load to provide baseline info and guide restoration
16	Feasibility assessment for removal of organics	Between Link River dam and Keno		Alternatives for organic matter removal to improve water quality in Keno Reservoir and in Klamath River downstream	Poor water quality resulting from high organic matter results in low survival of fish
17	Riparian vegetation response to channel and floodplain morphology, hydrology, and soils	Sprague River Basin	Gap in the ongoing Sprague assessments	Why similar management actions produce different vegetative responses in different places, and how to plan projects to achieve the desired vegetative response	Frames the geomorphic and hydrologic understanding of the Sprague in terms of riparian vegetation, which is the primary source of bank stability and the agent through which long-term channel narrowing will occur. This is the final link in the assessment chain.
18	Riparian vegetation monitoring	Sprague River Basin	Not included in FWS monitoring planning to date	Define potential natural communities throughout the Sprague Valley; track vegetative and bank stability response to management and climate across range of geomorphic types	Vegetation is arguably the single most important response variable in restoring the Sprague River. We must know what the trends are, where projects are working, where they are not
19	Updated thermal infrared radiometry (measures surface water temperature, helps ID groundwater inflows, irrigation return flows, effects of tributaries)	Sprague River system		Water temperature of Sprague River, tributaries, irrigation return flows, and groundwater accretions during summer	Identifies baseline temperature conditions and priority areas for restoration.

APPENDIX 2

FORMAT FOR PROJECT PRE-PROPOSALS

INSTRUCTIONS

Complete the Pre-proposal using the format outlined in this section. Pre-proposals should be ***2 pages*** or less, 12 font and 1-inch margins, formatted for 8.5 x 11-inch paper, and submitted as a single file electronically or on a CD.

Information requested on this application may be subject to release to the general public. Your submission of an application for federal funds from the Hatfield Restoration Program authorizes the release of application information.

1. **Project Title**
    a. Use a descriptive title which identifies the geographic area of the project.

2. **Funds Requested**
    a. Identify total funds requested.

3. **Project Proposer**
    a. Identify who is submitting this proposal (agency, tribe, etc.).
    b. Identify the contact person (name, title, address, phone, e-mail).

4. **Project Location**
    a. Describe the location of your proposal (e.g. Sprague River, River Mile 14, Williamson River Delta). Provide legal description including Township, Range, Section.

5. **Project Description**
    a. Describe the type of project you are proposing (e.g., wetland restoration, spring restoration, design for river restoration, research).
    b. Is it a project identified in the 5-Year Plan?
    c. State the project objectives (e.g., fence 12 miles of stream, remove 2 culverts, create 6 step pools to improve fish access to springs).
    d. Describe study design, project implementation approach.
    e. Reference watershed assessments, Sucker Recovery Plan, National Academy of Science Report and other applicable documents where possible.

6. Landowner Participation

a. How is the landowner/property manager involved with the project?

b. Is the landowner involved with other stewardship programs?

c. What is the landowner's cost-share (including in-kind contributions)?

7. Conservation Easement

a. Is there a conservation easement on any part of the property?

b. Is the landowner potentially interested in a conservation easement?

8. Cost-sharing

a. Are there partners who will share in the cost of this project?

b. Identify sources and amounts, and whether funds are secured or simply applied for.

9. Project Manager

a. Is there a Project Manager other than the Proposer who will oversee project completion?

10. Budget

a. Provide a budget including matching and in-kind contributions.

11. Design Proposals

a. Describe the qualifications and experience of the designers.

b. Identify similar projects completed and references.

APPENDIX 3
FORMAT FOR DETAILED PROJECT PROPOSALS

INSTRUCTIONS:

If your Pre-proposal was approved, submit a complete proposal using the following format. You must follow the format outlined in this section or your proposal will not be considered. Use separate pages for the budget sections of the proposal and supporting material, such as maps, pictures, and drawings. Projects in more than one location should be presented in separate proposals. Be brief. Keep it short and to the point.

Information requested on this application may be subject to release to the public. Your application for federal funds from the Hatfield Restoration Program authorizes the release of application information. Many people will be reviewing this proposal and their levels of expertise about your particular project will vary. Try to anticipate and answer questions.

Proposal Format. Successful proposals will be well-written, accurate, and concise. This proposal process requires that your proposal be submitted in electronic format as a single .PDF file. There are some formatting considerations that you need to keep in mind:

1. ***Page limits***. The proposal text should be no more than 10 pages, *excluding* literature cited, maps, photographs, figures, tables, and attachments. You may include attachments (although in the same file) that assist reviewers with their evaluations; however, ***it is essential that you present all critical information in the body of your proposal***. The proposal selection process depends on the written proposal as a stand-alone document.

2. ***Format.*** Body text must be 12-point in a readable typeface using single line spacing; text in tables and figures must be no smaller than 10-point in a readable typeface. If available, Times New Roman font is preferred. Headings must be 16-point, bold typeface, flush left. Page margins are to be one inch on all sides. All proposal pages, including diagrams, must be readable when printed in black and white on 8.5 x 11-inch paper. Avoid color and detail that will not photocopy clearly.

3. ***Submission Format.*** You must submit your proposal as a single .PDF file via email or on CD for receipt by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service—Klamath Falls Ecosystem Restoration Office by the December 15 deadline. If you need help in converting your document into a .PDF file, contact robes_parrish@fws.gov, akimi_king@fws.gov , or sue_mattenberger@fws.gov or call (541) 885-8481.

4. ***Maps, Photographs, Figures, and Tables.*** Each map, photograph, figure, or table needs to be individually numbered and clearly titled. Although not included in the 10-page limit, they must be appended to the proposal text in a single .PDF file. If you need help in incorporating these graphics into your proposal for submission as a single .PDF file, please contact robes_parrish@fws.gov, akimi_king@fws.gov , or sue_mattenberger@fws.gov or call (541) 885-8481.

5. ***Page Numbering.*** Each page of the proposal needs to be numbered sequentially at the bottom, center portion of the page.

Proposal Text. Your proposal should follow the outline below, incorporating each of the numbered sections.

1. ***Project Title***
    a. Use a descriptive title which identifies the geographic area of the project.

2. ***Project Proposer***
    a. Identify who is submitting this proposal (agency, tribe, etc.).
    b. Identify the contact person's name, title, address, phone number, and email.
    c. Note: only one entity can be a signatory to each proposal; i.e., ERO funds cannot be split administratively among more than one entity.

3. ***Abstract***
    a. In 300 words or less, describe:
        (1) the problem,
        (2) the proposed solution,
        (3) anticipated project benefits, and
        (4) how the requested funds will be used.

4. ***Background and Problem***
    a. Provide enough background information to bring the Science Team up to date on the need for this project. This will assist them in ranking your proposal.
    b. Describe the problem that your project is designed to address.
    c. Cite relevant studies or other information that documents the problem, and the ways this problem has been addressed at the project location or elsewhere.
    d. Describe the project's physical setting, with maps or photographs if appropriate. (Note: maps and photographs must be appended to the end of the text, but do not count toward the 10-page limit.)
    e. Note if previous restoration work has been completed at this location or on adjacent properties.

5. ***Project Goals and Objectives***
    a. Clearly state the goals and objectives of your proposal in complete sentences. It is important that your project addresses the Goals and Objectives listed in the 5-Year Plan (Appendix 1). Remember, goals are *general statements* and objectives are tangible and *measurable tasks* that can be quantified so progress towards achieving them can be assessed.

6. ***Approach and Scope of Work***
    a. Describe the approach or study design you will undertake to address your project's objectives. The proposal must include sufficient narrative detail for reviewers to fully understand and evaluate the technical merits of the project. This section should constitute the largest part of the proposal. The degree of detail should match the project complexity and technical difficulty to allow for full evaluation of the technical viability.
    b. Describe the specific actions which must be taken to achieve the project objectives. As applicable for your project, include specific information about

planning, project design, methods and techniques, construction procedures, equipment and facilities, sampling, data collection, criteria for hypothesis testing, statistical analysis, and quality assurance procedures.

c. Provide a brief description of design alternatives considered and the reasons for choosing the one(s) proposed.
d. Describe how restoration projects will be maintained over time.
e. Provide narrative detail about the tasks, deliverables, and schedule, including project management along with other key tasks.
f. Provide an annual time line that identifies when benchmarks will be accomplished.
g. Clearly identify how your approach will maximize the information richness and value to decision makers.
h. Important Note: Clearly indicate which tasks are contingent upon other tasks and which tasks can be done separately; *this information is necessary in case only part of the project is funded.*

7. *Specific Work Products*

a. Identify and elaborate on specific deliverable results of the project that you will produce and submit. Deliverables should report on the status of outcomes, and may include reports describing specific ecosystem benefits. Deliverables can also include presentations, workshops, seminars, educational programs, and publications, depending on your project type. Project managers will be required to submit annual and final project reports.

8. *Feasibility*

a. Describe how your proposed project is both feasible and appropriate for the proposed work.
b. Explain how the work you've outlined in your proposal can be completed on schedule given reasonably foreseeable constraints (e.g., weather conditions, planting seasons).
c. Thoroughly address any contingencies or requirements (e.g., dependence upon the outcome or timing of other projects or programs, upon natural or operational conditions, and on environmental compliance or permitting processes).
d. Identify any third party impacts that may result from your proposal and the principal measures proposed to mitigate them.
e. Identify any other issues that may affect your ability to carry out your proposal. Describe how you will resolve those issues.

9. *Data Handling and Storage*

a. Describe how you will handle, store, and share the data and other information generated by your project.

10. *Project Duration and Schedule*

a. Identify project duration from the beginning of project through submittal of a final report. Note that funds will not likely become available until June of 2007, so the duration of the project may extend beyond the end of the fiscal year (9/30/2007).
b. Identify points at which decisions could logically be made to modify or terminate a project.

c. Provide a detailed project schedule to include:
    (1) Initiation of project.
    (2) Completion date for each milestone or major task.
    (3) Submittal dates for reports.

11. ***Permits***

a. Landowners, Cooperators, and/or land management agencies are required to secure any federal, state, and local land use permits necessary to implement the project. This may include permits under Clean Water Act Sections 401 and 404, California Streambed Alteration Agreements or Oregon Division of State Lands, and others.
b. Compliance with Sections 7 and 10 of the Endangered Species Act, and the National Historic Preservation Act, as well as Department of the Interior regulations on hazardous substance determinations is required.
c. Project site surveys will be required in order to comply with these regulations. You should include the results of any completed archaeological or biological surveys in your proposal package. If surveys have not been completed, you may have to incorporate the cost of a survey into your proposal budget.
d. Evidence of landowner permission must be provided to the Klamath Basin Ecosystem Restoration Office.

12. ***Landowner Participation***

a. Provide the name and phone number of each landowner involved in the proposal.
b. Indicate how landowners will participate in the project.

13. ***Personnel, Qualifications, and Organization***

a. Identify all key personnel and who will be the project manager(s) or principal investigator(s).
b. Identify who will do the project design for restoration projects.
c. Briefly describe how the participants identified in your proposal provide the range of experience and expertise in the disciplines required for your project. If appropriate, highlight relevant field experience, completed projects, published reports, or other materials.
d. Specify individual roles and responsibilities for technical, administrative, and project management activities.
e. Describe the organizational structure for the staff and other resources.
f. For projects using consultants or subcontractors, briefly describe how they were selected and why.
g. A subcontractor role exceeding a quarter of the total project budget should be fully explained and clearly justified.
h. Identify all partners and explain the extent of their participation and collaboration in the project.
i. Highlight links between your project and landowners, organizations, and agencies that are carrying out complementary projects in the area or are responsible for managing the area's resources.
j. If your project will be using resources from other programs, discuss your staff's background in working with those programs and highlight how these programs will be integrated at the project level.

14. ***Cost-Sharing***

a. The Hatfield Committee and ERO realize that we can make our restoration dollars go further if other sources match our investments. Seek other funds and show these in your proposal.
b. Identify:
    (1) the type of match (federal, state, or other)
    (2) whether contribution is cash or in-kind
    (3) the status of the match (secured or pending)
    (4) a dollar amount, or a dollar value based on local market rates, of the in-kind contribution(s)
c. At the time of application, match funding does not have to be *secured*, but you must show that match funding has been *sought*. Provide a citation verifying the level of commitment identified. Note that past projects may not be used as in-kind contributions for this year.
d. Successful proposals identifying cost-sharing funds must have final commitments of those funds prior to agreement being signed. If you fail to secure the cost-share funds identified in your proposal by the time the agreement is ready to be signed, and as a result have insufficient guaranteed funds to complete your project, your award could be amended or terminated.
e. Successful proposals identifying matching funds will be required to report on the status of those investments at the time of proposal approval and thereafter in their project reports.

15. ***Budget***

a. Provide a detailed budget for the project, including line entries as described in the attached Estimated Budget Worksheet (Appendix 4).
b. Detail how matching or in-kind contributions are determined. Other contributions are those funds contributed to the project from other funding sources. In-kind contributions may include donated labor, materials, or equipment. ***Those projects with greater amounts of matching funds have a greater chance of receiving funding.***
c. Successful proposals will be funded from Fiscal Year 2007 appropriations only, and funding in future fiscal years is expected to be subject to annual competition.
d. Administrative overhead should not exceed 15 percent.
e. Project costs, qualifying in-kind and other contributions must reflect the only the current project period, and past projects may not be used as in-kind contributions for this year.
f. An agreement must be signed before any expenses are incurred, and all costs must be supported by appropriate invoices in order to be eligible for reimbursement.
g. The Budget portion of your proposal will be carefully reviewed. Be sure that all costs are presented as described above, and all computations are accurate. Budget tables are not included in the page limit.

16. ***Project Location***

a. Map: Include a U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5 minute quad, including the quad name, and mark the project location on the map (not included in the page limit).

b. Legal Description: Provide all applicable Township, Range, Section, and Quarter Sections containing the project location.
c. Watershed: Identify the smallest stream tributary and watershed(s) where the project will occur. Example: Jack Creek, tributary of the Sprague River.
d. Habitat Description: A brief description of the habitat at the site and within the watershed (e.g., second and third growth Ponderosa pine forest).
e. Land Use: A brief description of the land use history and the current land use at the site and within the watershed (e.g., historically used for timber production, currently used for cattle grazing).

17. ***Performance Plan***

a. Proposals should include a plan to monitor project effectiveness or performance evaluation (if applicable). The plan should include a list of project-specific performance measures that will be used to assess project success in relation to the goals and objectives, and should detail how the performance measures will be quantified for reviewers to effectively evaluate the performance evaluation plan. For most types of projects, project success is determined by measuring activities, outputs, and outcomes.

18. ***Literature Cited***

a. All research and assessment proposals should include references to related research studies, project reports, scientific reports, and other supporting information cited in the proposal (not included in the page limit).

19. ***Land Management Plan***

a. Describe how the landowner plans to utilize the project area during the term of the agreement (e.g., grazing strategy in project area including season of use, number and types of livestock, watering strategy, water management regimes for wetland restoration).

20. ***Project Summary***

a. Include a completed Summary Sheet (Appendix 5) (not included in the page limit).

APPENDIX 4

ESTIMATED BUDGET WORKSHEET

	TOTAL BUDGET	*FWS/ERO Funds Requested*	*Other Federal Funds*		*Non-Federal Cost-Share*		
			Applied For	*Secured*	*Applied For*	*Funds Secured*	*In-Kind Contrib.*
1) Personnel: Position, # Hours @ Hourly Rate Subtotal Personnel	$	$	$	$	$	$	$
2) Subcontractors: Task, # Hours @ Hourly Rate Subtotal Subcontractors	$	$	$	$	$	$	$
3) Materials and Supplies: Item, #Units @ Cost/Unit Subtotal Materials and Supplies	$	$	$	$	$	$	$
4) Operating Expenses: Subtotal Operating Expenses	$	$	$	$	$	$	$
SUBTOTAL DIRECT COSTS	$	$	$	$	$	$	$
5) Administrative Overhead Expenses:	$	$	$	$	$	$	$
TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET	$	$	$	$	$	$	$

% Administrative Overhead (5) ÷ Total)	%
% of Total Requested from USFWS (Column 2 TOTAL $ ÷ Column 1 TOTAL $)	%

APPENDIX 5

PROJECT SUMMARY SHEET

1. Project Title
2. Funds Requested
3. Project Proposer
    a. Agency/Organization
    b. Contact Person and Title
    c. Address
    d. Phone
    e. E-mail
4. Project Location
5. Project Description
6. Project Objective(s)
7. Cost-Share Funds and In-Kind Contributions
8. Project Manager

APPENDIX 6

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR RESTORATION PROJECTS

Criteria for Pre-Proposal

1. Relevance to Objectives presented in Column E of the 5-Year Plan
2. Cost/benefit (includes cooperator inputs and demonstration and research benefits)
3. Landowner Commitment

Criteria for Full Proposal

1. Relevance to objectives presented in Column E of the 5-Year Plan
2. Benefit to sucker recovery
    a. Magnitude of effect
    b. Addresses underlying causes of problems
3. Benefit to ecosystem
    a. Magnitude of effect
    b. Addresses underlying causes of problems
4. Contributes to reliable water deliveries
    a. Magnitude of effect
    b. Addresses underlying causes of problems
5. Cost effectiveness
6. Feasibility
    a. Supported by adequate assessment
    b. Expectations are identified and realistic
    c. Compatibility with adjacent land use and other projects
    d. Effectiveness of technical design
    e. Ability to successfully implement
7. Improves water quality
8. Improves hydrologic function
9. Quick response time
10. Monitoring
    a. Response variables are measurable
    b. Project effect is measurable
    c. Monitoring and evaluation plan
11. Benefits other species
12. Collaboration with other partners
13. Risk assessment
    a. Lack of adverse effects
    b. Synergistic effects with other actions
    c. Low risk of project failure
    d. Low cost of project failure
14. Landowner involvement
    a. Level of commitment present (or not necessary)
    b. Burden of operations and maintenance is reasonable
    c. Economic benefits to landowner

APPENDIX 7

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT PROJECTS

Generally, research and assessment proposals must advance knowledge in such a way that decrease uncertainties associated with designing and implementing restoration projects. Monitoring projects must be efficiently designed to quantify environmental indicators and changes associated with restoration. Criteria used for project evaluation include:

1. Results likely to decrease key uncertainties
    a) Adequate levels of accuracy and precision
    b) Changes in key response variables quantified

2. Relevance to Goals and Objectives outlined in the 5-Year Plan
    a) Species recovery, ecosystem restoration, reliable water deliveries
    b) Directly facilitates restoration activities in 5-Year Plan

3. Methods adequate to meet purpose and objectives
    a) Purpose, hypothesis (for research proposals) and objectives clearly stated

4. Overall value of products
    a) Accessibility and usefulness to decision-makers
    b) Geographic focus
    c) Collaborative approach enhances public acceptance

5. Capabilities of project team
    a) Qualifications and track record
    b) Ability to complete the project

6. Cost-benefit assessment
    a) Reasonable for the work proposed
    b) Relative to expected benefits

APPENDIX 8

CONTRACTING REQUIREMENTS

** IMPORTANT **

Successful project proposers must submit an SF-424, Application for Federal Assistance, and obtain and include a *Dun and Bradstreet Data Universal Numbering System* (DUNS) number with their project proposal. The DUNS number is a unique nine-character identification number provided by the commercial company Dun & Bradstreet (D&B). Call D&B at 1-866-705-5711, if you do not have a DUNS number. The process to request a DUNS number takes about 10 minutes and is free of charge. Your SF-424 must be submitted to ERO before a contract can be signed.

Successful project proposers are also required to register with the *Central Contractor Registration* (CCR) in order to do business with the Federal government. The CCR is the primary vendor database for the Department of Treasury. The CCR collects, validates, stores and disseminates data in support of agency missions. You may register online with CCR at: *www.ccr.gov*.

Both current and potential government vendors are required to register in CCR in order to do be awarded contracts by Treasury. Private individuals do not need to register with CCR or DUNS. Vendors are required to complete a one-time registration to provide basic information relevant to procurement and financial transactions. Vendors must update or renew their registration annually to maintain an active status.

To obtain more information regarding *Dun and Bradstreet Data Universal Numbering System* or *Central Contractor Registration*, please contact Joni Drinkwater, Administrative Officer, by email at *joni_drinkwater@fws.gov*, or call (541) 885-2510.